EXHIBIT 6

	H6EHLUMS	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	V .	16 Cr. 483 (JSR)
5	STEFAN LUMIERE,	
6		Sentence
7	Defendant.	
8	x	
9		New York, N.Y. June 14, 2017 9:40 a.m.
11		5.10 a.m.
12	Before:	
	HON. JED S. RAKOFF,	
13		District Judge
14	APPEARANCES	
15	JOON H. KIM	
16	Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York IAN McGINLEY DAMIAN WILLIAMS	
17		
18	Assistant United States Attorney	
19	JONATHAN HALPERN JONATHAN FRIEDMAN	
20	Attorneys for Defendant	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

H6EHLUMS

(Case called)

THE COURT: Good morning. All right. So the parties have stipulated to a gain amount. This is a stipulation "for sentencing purposes only," whatever that may mean. That a reasonable estimate of the gains resulting from the fraud is between 1.5 million and 3.1 million. I've reviewed that calculation and the basis for it. I find that it is a reasonable calculation. The government also still asserts the possibility of a loss, a larger loss calculation. I've reviewed that calculation, and I don't find it sufficiently adequately supported to adopt. So I will adopt the gain calculation, which means that to the base offense level of seven, there is added an enhancement of 16 points. The parties still disagree as to the other enhancements, the two-point enhancement for ten or more victims and the four-point enhancement for associations with an investment adviser.

I'm persuaded by the government's arguments, and so I will add those two enhancements for a total offense level of 29, for a guideline range of 87 to 108 months in prison.

However, if I did not add those enhancements and adopted the defense position, the total offense level would be 23, and the guideline range would be 46 to 57 months. Excuse me. Sit down, counsel. And my sentence, which is going to be below either of the guideline ranges, would be exactly the same whether those enhancements were added or not. They are totally

H6EHLUMS

THE COURT: Well, the main issue in white-collar cases is often general deterrence, and there is a body of literature largely ignored by the sentencing commission but which suggests that, on the one hand, heavy sentences do not serve added deterrent effect in white-collar cases, but that, on the other hand, some meaningful prison time does serve a major deterring effect in white-collar cases because it sends the message to others similarly situated that you can't buy your way out of this.

MR. HALPERN: I understand that's a factor.

Certainly, that's to be considered, along with the seriousness of the offense and other objectives. Under these really extraordinary circumstances for Mr. Lumiere personally, individually, those other factors that make some reference to that, when your Honor considers that, whatever punishment your Honor imposes is going to be disproportionately harsh because of the circumstances Mr. Lumiere finds himself in as outlined in the PSR, including paragraphs 119 and 120.

THE COURT: Based on my own assessment of some of the materials you presented in that regard, I think one could quibble here or there. I essentially accept the basic picture that's been portrayed there. So I don't think we need to get into that in great detail, unless you want to. So I understand the argument that you're making there.

MR. HALPERN: I would just say he is, because of those

H6EHLUMS

will be suspended based on the Court's determination that he poses a low risk of future substance abuse.

There will also be imposed the standard conditions of supervision 1 through 13. They appear on the face of the judgment and will be gone over with the defendant by the probation officer when he reports to begin his period of supervised release, which he must do within 72 hours of his release from prison, and he will be supervised by the district of his residence. There are other special conditions recommended by the probation office, but I don't think they're necessary. Finally, there's a special assessment of \$300 which is mandatory and must be paid.

Now, before I advise the defendant of his right of appeal, anything else that counsel wants to raise for the Court? First, anything from the government?

MR. McGINLEY: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything from the defense?

MR. HALPERN: I'm sorry, your Honor, respectfully, if I just may be heard with respect to restitution, and I apologize to your Honor if I misheard. I had thought your Honor was saying earlier in response to my inquiry there was going to be zero restitution. It's also, I would respectfully submit, not applicable here because of gain and not actual loss and identifiable victims. So —

THE COURT: No, that's not a frivolous position.

What's the government's position?

MR. McGINLEY: Your Honor, I think, just to be safe, the government would forgo the restitution.

THE COURT: So no --

MR. McGINLEY: If I just --

THE COURT: Not impose the restitution.

MR. McGINLEY: And if I just may, just for the record, because sometimes these proceedings wind up in other proceedings, the government does not concede that there was no actual loss to these victims, but it has not been finally determined.

eloquently put forth in its many submissions, was that there was huge loss, but I have not been persuaded that the methodology is sufficiently accurate to permit that calculation, but the government fully maintains its rights.

And with respect to forfeiture, I understand the government, if not in this case but certainly in some cases, is going to try to narrow <code>Honeycutt</code>, and all your rights are preserved. So we'll just leave it with the fine so far as the financial aspects of this sentence are concerned.

Anything else?

MR. HALPERN: Yes, your Honor, if I may, two things -three things. First thing, if I may, in terms of reporting
recommendation, if I could request your Honor, understanding